(c) what was the bulk drug price taken into account for working out the formulation price;

(d) whether IDPL sold any quantity to non-associated formulators; and

(e) if so, what are the details thereof indicating the name of the party, the quantity and the price charged?

THE MINISTER OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI VEERENDRA PATIL): (a) IDPL have not installed any capacity for the commercial manufacture of Glybanclamide. However, in course of Research and Development work in-house, certain quantity was produced and used.

(b) and (c) IDPL marketed the formulation under brand name of 'Idimide' based on Glybenclamide. The strength is 5 mg/tablet. IDPL follows the leader price of Rs. 6.65 (including excise duty) fixed for a pack of 10x10 tablets.

(d) and (e) As the IDPL did not undertake commercial production of Glybenclamide bulk, the question of sale of the same to any non-associated formulator does not arise.

Association of Multinationals or Non-resident Indains with construction of fertilizer plants

2308. SHRI K. VASUDEVA PANICKER: Will the Minister of CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS be pleased to state.

(a) whether any multinational firm or non-resident Indians are associated with the setting up of new fertilizer units under erection; and

(b) if so, what are the details thereof?

THE MINISTER OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI VEERENDRA PATIL): (a) and (b) M/s. Caparo Group, London, has offered to set up a gas-based fertilizer project at Shahjahanpur in U.P., at an estimated cost of Rs. 620 crores, with 50 per cent of the equity as non-resident Indian investment.

Manufacture of drugs of doubtful validity

2309. SHRI RAJNI RANJAN SAHU: Will the Minister of CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS be pleased to refer to the answer to Unstarred Question 2826 given in the Rajya Sabha on the 22nd August, 1983 and state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the manufacturers are increasing production of formulations of doubtful validity which are exempted from price control;

(b) whether it is a fact that Government neither allowed re-endorsement nor instructed the companies to stop production;

(c) what was the production of each product for the previous three years, year-wise, as mentioned in the application for re-endorsement of capacity by each company and what was their production during 1984-85;

(d) what are the names of the formulations of each company of doubtful validity, based on imported and canalised bulk drugs;

(e) what was the consumption of each drug by each company during 1979-80 and 1984-85;

(f) what are the reasons for not putting restriction on their imports and allocations of canalised drugs;

(g) whether it is also a fact that companies are marketing without price approval and overcharging and expanding production unauthorisedly; and

(h) if so, what action was taken against them?

THE MINISTER OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI VEERENDRA PATIL): (a) and (d) Production and sources of raw materials of individual formulations are not monitored.

(b), (c), (e) and (f) Re-endorsement was not granted to products being manufactured with doubtful industrial validity. It was considered not to be expedient to order stoppage of all such formulations for a number of reasons such as:

(i) The diversity of the facts which render the industrial approvals claimed of doubtful validity.

(ii) the large number of companies and the large number of formulations involved.

(iii) the essentiality of some of these formulations;

(iv) the manufacture of many of these formulations being carried on for several years and in some cases for more than a decade and the products having been accepted in the market and by the medical profession.

An Inter-Ministerial Working Group (IMWG) was set up in 1982 to go into the question of production of drugs without valid industrial approvals and suggest the possible lines of action that may be taken. The IMWG has submitted its report. The Government have yet to take a final decision on the recommendations of the IMWG.

(g) and (h) The information would be collected and laid on the Table of the House.

Import of Fenbendazole

2310. SHRI BHAGATRAM MANHAR: Will the Minister of CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS be pleased to refer to the answer to Unstarred Question 271 given in the Rajya Sabha on the 18th March, 1985 and state:

(a) whether it is a fact that Hoechst imported Fenbendazole and Fenbendazole base;

(b) if so, what was the quantity imported during the last three years, year-wise, upto the 30th June, 1985 indicating the source of import and landed price per kg, consignment-wise;

(c) what are the reasons for not specifying this drug in this schedule and fixing the price of the drug without technical and cost study;

(d) what are the names of other companies who imported this drug, indicating the quantity source and landed price per kg of each;

(e) what was the sales turn-over of formulations based on this drug of Hoechst during the last three years, year-wise;

(f) whether any other company is marketing formulations based on this drug;

(g) if so, what is the name of the company, its product, and price fixed for each pack; and

(h) what are the names of other drugs still to be specified under schedule?

THE MINISTER OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI VEERENDRA PATIL): (a) an (b) Information to the extent available would be collected and laid on the Table of the Rajya Sabha.

(c) Formulations based on Fenbendazole are price controlled. Based on the application of M/s. Hoechst submitted under Drugs (Price Control) Order, 1979 it was noticed that the indigenous price as communicated by them was not significantly different from the landed cost of imports. It was, therefore, decided not to list